ll ll						
1	BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General of the State of California					
2	PAUL AMENT					
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General RICHARD D. MARINO, State Bar No. 90471					
4	Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice					
5	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013					
6	Telephone: (213) 897-8644 Facsimile: (213) 897-9395					
7	E-mail: Richard.Marino@doj.ca.gov					
	Attorneys for Complainant					
8	DEEODE 1	מער				
9	BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY					
10	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS					
11	STATE OF CAL					
12	In the Matter of the Petition to Revoke Probation Against:	Case No. D1-2002-133222				
13	LEONARD K. SCOTT, M.D.	DEFAULT DECISION				
14		AND ORDER				
15	Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 28912	[Gov. Code, §11520]				
16	Respondent.					
17		. :				
18	FINDINGS O	F FACT				
19						
20	1. On or about March 30, 2006, Complainant David T. Thornton, in his					
21	official capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of					
22	Consumer Affairs (Board), filed Petition to Revoke Probation No. D1-2002-133222 against					
23	Leonard K. Scott, M.D. (Respondent) before the Board's Division of Medical Quality (Division					
24	2. On or about March 21, 1975,	the Division issued Physician and Surgeon's				
25	Certificate No. A 28912 to Respondent. The Physician and Surgeon's Certificate was in full					
26	force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein subject to the Decision and					
27	Order issued In the Matter of the Accusation Against Leonard K. Scott, Case No.					

28 11-2002-133222, revoking Respondent's medical license, staying the revocation, and placing

Respondent on probation for three years with terms and conditions, effective July 14, 2005. The Physician and Surgeon's Certificate expired on October 31, 2006. On November 29, 2006, it was renewed.

- 3. On or about March 30, 2006, a legal analyst for the Medical Board of California, Discipline Coordination Unit, served by U.S. Postal Service Certified Mail a copy of the Petition to Revoke Probation No. D1-2002-133222, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Division, which was and is 421 E. Angeleno Street, Suite 101, Burbank, California 91501. A copy of the Petition to Revoke Probation and related documents, including the Declaration of Service, are collectively attached as Exhibit 1, and are incorporated herein by reference.
- 4. Service of the Petition to Revoke Probation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).
- 5. On or about April 24, 2006, the aforementioned documents were returned by the U.S. Postal Service because they were not claimed by the addressee. The envelope containing the documents, marked "unclaimed," along with a copy of the "Track & Confirm" report prepared by the U.S. Postal Service for returned documents are attached hereto as Exhibit 2, and incorporated herein by reference.
 - 6. Government Code section 11506, subsection (c), provides:
 - "(c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing."
- 7. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of the Petition to Revoke Probation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of the Petition to Revoke Probation No. D1-2002-133222.

- 8. California Government Code section 11520, subsection (s), in pertinent part, provides:
 - "(a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent."
- 9. Medical Board Investigator Paul Ramirez searched the Medical Board's records concerning Respondent and found a residence of 504 Wapello Street, Altadena, California 91001-1612, and a fictitious name permit address of 1304 W. Foothill Boulevard, Suite E, Rialto, California 92376. Investigator Ramirez attempted to contact Respondent at these addresses in addition to Respondent's address without success. (Declaration of Paul Ramirez.)
- 10. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Division finds Respondent is in default. The Division will take action without further hearing and, based on Respondent's express admissions by way of default and the evidence before it, contained in Exhibits 1, 2 and 3, and the Declaration of Paul Ramirez, finds that the allegations in Accusation/Petition to Revoke Probation No. D1-2002-133222 are true.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

- 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Leonard K. Scott has subjected his Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 28912 to discipline.
- 2. A copy of the Petition to Revoke Probation and the related documents and Declaration of Service are attached.
- 3. Respondent's address of record with the Medical Board of California is, and at all times relevant to the proceedings herein, 421 E. Angeleno Street, Suite 201, Burbank, California 91501.
 - 4. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.

5. On June 27, 2005, the Medical Board of California received the certified mail receipt card indicating that its decision *In the Matter of the Accusation Against Leonard K. Scott,* Case No. 11-2002-133222, revoking Respondent's medical license, staying the revocation, and placing Respondent on probation for three years with terms and conditions was successfully delivered to Respondent's address of record on June 21, 2005. (Exhibit 3.) Since the commencement of Respondent's probation, Respondent has not contacted his probation surveillance monitor or anyone with the Medical Board of California regarding the terms and conditions of his probation. The Division of Medical Quality is authorized to revoke Respondent's Physician and Surgeon's Certificate based upon his failure to comply with the following conditions of his probation, as alleged in the Petition to Revoke Probation:

- a. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 1 required Respondent to submit to the Division within 60 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order an educational program aimed at correcting Respondent's areas of deficient practice which shall consist of not less than 40 hours per year in addition to any continuing medical education required to be performed for renewal of the physician and surgeon's certificate. Respondent failed to comply with Condition 1.
- b. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 2 required that Respondent enroll in an approved prescribing practices course within 60 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order and further required that Respondent successfully complete the course within six months of the effective date of the disciplinary order. Respondent has not complied with Condition 2 of his probation.
- c. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 3 required Respondent to enroll in an approved medical record keeping course within 60 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order and to complete the course during the first six months of probation. Respondent has not complied with Condition 3 of this probation.

- d. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 4 required Respondent to enroll in an approved ethics course within 60 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order. Respondent has not complied with Condition 4 of his probation.
- e. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 5 required Respondent to enroll in the Physician Assessment and Clinical Education (PACE) program or an equivalent clinical training and education program within 60 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order. Respondent has not complied with Condition 5 of his probation
- f. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 9 required that Respondent submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury stating whether he has complied and continues to complies with the terms and conditions of his probation. Respondent has not complied with Condition 9 of his probation.
- g. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 10 required that Respondent keep the Division of Medical Quality informed of his current business and residence addresses. Respondent no longer practices at the last business address provided by him to the Medical Board of California--namely, 421 Angeleno, Suite 101, Burbank, CA 91501; and, Respondent no longer lives at the last residence address provided by him to the Medical Board of California-namely, 504 Wapello St., Altadena, CA 91001. Respondent has not provided either his current business or residence address to the Medical Board of California since the commencement of his probation.
- h. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 11 required that Respondent be available for interviews at his place of business or at the probation unit office, upon request. Respondent has not complied with Condition 11 of his probation.
 - i. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's

probation, Condition 16 required that Respondent, within 90 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order, shall reimburse the Division the amount of \$3,000 for its costs of investigation, prosecution, and enforcement. Respondent has not complied with Condition 11 of his probation.

ORDER

2

1

3

4

5 6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Exhibit 1:

21 Exhibit 2:

22 Exhibit 3:

23 24

25

26

27

28

IT IS SO ORDERED that Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 28912, heretofore issued to Respondent Leonard K. Scott, M.D., is revoked.

Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

This Decision shall become effective on February 28, 2007

January 29, 2007 It is so ORDERED

MEDICAL BOAKD OF CAL

Barbara Yaroslavsky, Chair Panel B

50092238.wpd DOJ docket number:LA2006500457

Attachments:

Accusation/Petition to Revoke Probation No.D1-2002-133222, Related Documents, and Declaration of Service

Track & Confirm Report

Certified Mail Receipt 7004-1160-5371-1388

Declaration of Paul Ramirez

STATE OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General of the State of California RICHARD D. MARINO, State Bar No. 90471

Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice

300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702

Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-8644 Facsimile: (213) 897-9395

E-mail: Richard.Marino@doi.ca.gov

Attorneys for Complainant

BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Petition to Revoke Probation Against:

LEONARD K. SCOTT

421 E. Angeleno, Suite 101 Burbank, CA 91501

Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 28912

Respondent.

Case No. D1-2002-133222

PETITION TO REVOKE **PROBATION**

Complainant alleges:

PARTIES

- 1. David T. Thornton (Complainant) brings this Petition to Revoke Probation solely in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs (Board).
- 2. On or about March 21, 1975, the Board issued Physician and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 28912 to Leonard K. Scott (Respondent). The Physician and Surgeon's Certificate was in effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on October 31, 2006, unless renewed.
- 3. In a disciplinary action entitled In the Matter of the Accusation Against Leonard K. Scott, Case No. 11-2002-133222, the Board's Division of Medical Quality

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

(Division), issued a decision, effective July 14, 2005, in which Respondent's Physician and Surgeon's Certificate was revoked. However, the revocation was stayed and Respondent's certificate was placed on probation for a period of three (3) years with certain terms and conditions. A copy of that decision is attached as Exhibit A and is incorporated by reference.

JURISDICTION

- 4. This Petition to Revoke Probation is brought before the Division of Medical Quality (Division) for the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.
 - 5. Section 2004 of the Code states:

"The Division of Medical Quality shall have the responsibility for the following:

- "(a) The enforcement of the disciplinary and criminal provisions of the Medical Practice Act.
 - "(b) The administration and hearing of disciplinary actions.
- "(c) Carrying out disciplinary actions appropriate to findings made by a medical quality review committee, the division, or an administrative law judge.
- "(d) Suspending, revoking, or otherwise limiting certificates after the conclusion of disciplinary actions.
- "(e) Reviewing the quality of medical practice carried out by physician and surgeon certificate holders under the jurisdiction of the board."
 - 6. Section 2220 of the Code states:

"Except as otherwise provided by law, the Division of Medical Quality may take action against all persons guilty of violating this chapter [Chapter 5, the Medical Practice Act]. The division shall enforce and administer this article as to physician and surgeon certificate holders, and the division shall have all the powers granted in this chapter for these purposes including, but not limited to:

"(a) Investigating complaints from the public, from other licensees, from health care facilities, or from a division of the board that a physician and surgeon may be guilty

of unprofessional conduct. The board shall investigate the circumstances underlying any report received pursuant to Section 805 within 30 days to determine if an interim suspension order or temporary restraining order should be issued. The board shall otherwise provide timely disposition of the reports received pursuant to Section 805.

- "(b) Investigating the circumstances of practice of any physician and surgeon where there have been any judgments, settlements, or arbitration awards requiring the physician and surgeon or his or her professional liability insurer to pay an amount in damages in excess of a cumulative total of thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000) with respect to any claim that injury or damage was proximately caused by the physician's and surgeon's error, negligence, or omission.
- "(c) Investigating the nature and causes of injuries from cases which shall be reported of a high number of judgments, settlements, or arbitration awards against a physician and surgeon."
- 7. Section 2227 of the Code provides that a licensee who is found guilty under the Medical Practice Act may have his or her license revoked, suspended for a period not to exceed one year, placed on probation and required to pay the costs of probation monitoring, or such other action taken in relation to discipline as the Division deems proper.

8. Section 2228 of the Code states:

"The authority of the board or a division of the board or the California Board of Podiatric Medicine to discipline a licensee by placing him or her on probation includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- "(a) Requiring the licensee to obtain additional professional training and to pass an examination upon the completion of the training. The examination may be written or oral, or both, and may be a practical or clinical examination, or both, at the option of the board or division or the administrative law judge.
- "(b) Requiring the licensee to submit to a complete diagnostic examination by one or more physicians and surgeons appointed by the division. If an examination is ordered, the board or division shall receive and consider any other report of a complete

diagnostic examination given by one or more physicians and surgeons of the licensee's choice.

- "(c) Restricting or limiting the extent, scope, or type of practice of the licensee, including requiring notice to applicable patients that the licensee is unable to perform the indicated treatment, where appropriate.
- "(d) Providing the option of alternative community service in cases other than violations relating to quality of care, as defined by the Division of Medical Quality."
 - 9. Section 2234 of the Code states:

"The Division of Medical Quality shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- "(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter [Chapter 5, the Medical Practice Act].
 - "(b) Gross negligence.
- "(c) Repeated negligent acts. To be repeated, there must be two or more negligent acts or omissions. An initial negligent act or omission followed by a separate and distinct departure from the applicable standard of care shall constitute repeated negligent acts.
- "(1) An initial negligent diagnosis followed by an act or omission medically appropriate for that negligent diagnosis of the patient shall constitute a single negligent act.
- "(2) When the standard of care requires a change in the diagnosis, act, or omission that constitutes the negligent act described in paragraph (1), including, but not limited to, a reevaluation of the diagnosis or a change in treatment, and the licensee's conduct departs from the applicable standard of care, each departure constitutes a separate and distinct breach of the standard of care.
 - "(d) Incompetence.

- "(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
- "(f) Any action or conduct which would have warranted the denial of a certificate."

FIRST CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Education Course)

- 10. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 1 required Respondent to submit to the Division within 60 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order an educational program aimed at correcting Respondent's areas of deficient practice which shall consist of not less than 40 hours per year in addition to any continuing medical education required to be performed for renewal of the physician and surgeon's certificate.
- 11. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition 1, referenced above. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are as follows:
 - A. On or about June 27, 2005, the Medical Board of California received the certified mail receipt card indicating that its decision *In the Matter of the Accusation Against Leonard K. Scott,* Case No. 11-2002-133222, revoking Respondent's medical license, staying the revocation, and placing Respondent on probation for three years with terms and conditions was successfully delivered to Respondent's address of record.
 - B. Medical Board Investigator Paul Ramirez was assigned as Respondent's probation monitor. On or about and between June and November 2005, Investigator Paul Ramirez made numerous attempts to notify Respondent of the "probation intake interview" and other matters related to Respondent's probation. Among other things, Investigator Ramirez sent letters to Respondent's address of record and last known residence address. The letter sent to Respondent's address of record was returned, marked "Moved." Investigator

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
C
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

Ramirez called the last known telephone numbers for Respondent at his address of record, residence, last known place of employment, and last known location of all previously held fictitious name permits. Investigator Ramirez visited the location of corresponding to Respondent's active fictitious name permit. All attempts to contact Respondent failed.

- C. Since the commencement of Respondent's probation,
 Respondent has not contacted the Medical Board or his probation monitor
 regarding the terms and conditions of his probation; and, to date, Respondent has
 failed to comply with numerous terms and conditions of his probation.
- D. Respondent did not submit within 60 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order or at any other time an educational program aimed at correcting Respondent's areas of deficient practice which shall consist of not less than 40 hours per year

SECOND CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Prescribing Practices Course)

- 12. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 2 required that Respondent enroll in an approved prescribing practices course within 60 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order and further required that Respondent successfully complete the course within six months of the effective date of the disciplinary order.
- 13. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition 2, referenced above. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are as follows:
 - A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates paragraph 11, subparagraphs A through C, inclusive, as though fully set forth.
 - B. To date, Respondent has neither completed nor even enrolled in a prescribing practices course.

1	
2	
3	
4	rec
5	the
6	of
7	
8	COI
9	thi
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	rec
18	the
19	
20	co
21	thi
22	
23	
24	
25	w .
26	
27.	

THIRD CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Medical Record Keeping Course)

- 14. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 3 required Respondent to enroll in an approved medical record keeping course within 60 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order and to complete the course during the first six months of probation.
- 15. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition 3, referenced above. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are as follows:
 - A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates paragraph 11, subparagraphs A through C, inclusive, as though fully set forth.
 - B. To date, Respondent has neither enrolled, completed, nor sought approval for a medical record keeping course.

FOURTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Ethics Course)

- 16. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 4 required Respondent to enroll in an approved ethics course within 60 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order.
- 17. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition 4, referenced above. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are as follows:
 - A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates paragraph 11, subparagraphs A through C, inclusive, as though fully set forth.
 - B. To date, Respondent has neither enrolled nor sought approval for an ethics course.

FIFTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Clinical Training Program)

18. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 5

23.

28

8

Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to

comply with Probation Condition 10, referenced above. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are as follows:

- A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates paragraph 11, subparagraphs A through C, inclusive, as though fully set forth.
- B. Respondent no longer practices at the last business address provided by him to the Medical Board of California--namely, 421 Angeleno, Suite 101, Burbank, CA 91501; and, Respondent no longer lives at the last residence address provided by him to the Medical Board of California-namely, 504 Wapello St., Altadena, CA 91001. Respondent has not provided either his current business or residence address to the Medical Board of California since the commencement of his probation.

EIGHTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Interview)

- 24. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 11 required that Respondent be available for interviews at his place of business or at the probation unit office, upon request.
- 25. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition 11, referenced above. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are as follows:
 - A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates paragraph 11, subparagraphs A through C, inclusive, as though fully set forth.
 - B. On or about and during July, August, September and October 2005, Respondent's probation monitor made multiple attempts to contact Respondent for the purpose of having Respondent come to the Medical Board's District Office to submit to an interview and to discuss the terms and conditions of his probation. All attempts were unsuccessful. To date, Respondent has not submitted to an interview with the Medical Board of California in connection with his probation.

NINTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Cost Recovery)

- 26. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 16 required that Respondent, within 90 days of the effective date of the disciplinary order, shall reimburse the Division the amount of \$3,000 for its costs of investigation, prosecution, and enforcement.
- 27. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition 16, referenced above. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are as follows:
 - A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates paragraph 11, subparagraphs A through C, inclusive, as though fully set forth.
 - B. To date, Respondent has not reimbursed the Division the sum of \$3,000 or any other sum for the costs of the Board's investigation, enforcement and prosecution of the underlying case.
 - C To date, Respondent has not contacted his probation compliance monitor or anyone else for the purpose of making arrangements to reimburse the Board its costs of investigation, enforcement and prosecution of the underlying case.

.25

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Division of Medical Quality issue a decision:

- 1. Revoking the probation that was granted by the Medical Board of California in Case No. 11-2002-133222 and imposing the disciplinary order that was stayed thereby revoking Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 28912 issued to Leonard K. Scott;
- 2. Revoking or suspending Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 28912, issued to Leonard K. Scott;
- 3. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of Leonard K. Scott's authority to supervise physician's assistants, pursuant to section 3527 of the Code;
- 4. Ordering Leonard K. Scott, if again placed on probation, to pay the Division of Medical Quality the costs of probation monitoring; and,
 - 5. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: March 30, 2006

DAVID T. THORN
Executive Director

Executive Director

Medical Board of California

Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California Complainant

Exhibit A

Decision and Order

Medical Board of California Case No. D1-2002-133222

BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 206

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:)	
LEONARD SCOTT, M.D.)	File No. 11-2002-133222
Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 28912)))	
Respondent))	

DECISION

The attached **Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order** is hereby adopted as the Decision and Order of the Division of Medical Quality of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on <u>July 14, 2005</u>.

IT IS SO ORDERED June 14, 2005

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

By:

Ronald L. Moy, M.D.

Chair

Panel B

Division of Medical Quality

2	of the State of California RICHARD D. MARINO, State Bar No. 90471 Deputy Attorney General					
3	California Department of Justice 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702					
2						
5	Facsimile: (213) 897-9395 E-mail: richard marino@doi.ca.gov					
6						
7						
8	BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY					
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONGUNED AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROP					
10	STATE OF CAL	IFORNIA				
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 11-2002-133222				
12	LEONARD K. SCOTT, M.D. 421 E. Angelina	OAH No. L2003030917				
13	Burbank, ČA 91501	STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND				
14	Physician & Surgeon's Certificate No. A 28912,	DISCIPLINARY ORDER				
15	Respondent.					
16						
17	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AN	D AGREED by and between the parties to				
18	the above-entitled proceedings that the following ma	tters are true:				
19	<u>PARTIE</u>	<u>s</u>				
20		utive Director of the Medical Board of				
21	California and brought this action solely in his then official capacity. David T. Thornton is the					
22	Interim Executive Director of the Medical Board of (California and is represented in this matter				
23	by Bill Lockyer, Attorney General of the State of California, by Richard D. Marino, Deputy					
24	Attorney General.					
25	2. Leonard K. Scott, M.D. (Respo	ondent) is representing himself, in propria				
26	persona, in this proceeding and has chosen not to exercise his right to be represented by counsel.					
27	3. On or about March 21, 1975, tl	ne Medical Board of California issued				
28	Physician & Surgeon Certificate No. A 28912 to Leon	nard K. Scott, M.D. (Respondent). The				

Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 11-2002-133222 and will expire on October 31, 2004, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

4. Accusation No. 11-2002-133222 was filed before the Division of Medical Quality (Division) for the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, and is currently pending against Respondent. The Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on January 23, 2003. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of Accusation No. 11-2002-133222 is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 5. Respondent has carefully read, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 11-2002-133222. Respondent has also carefully read, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order.
- 6. Respondent is fully aware of his legal rights in this matter, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to be represented by counsel at his own expense; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him; the right to present evidence and to testify on his own behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.
- 7. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

CULPABILITY

- 8. Respondent admits the truth of each and every charge and allegation in Accusation No. 11-2002-133222.
- 9. Respondent agrees that his Physician & Surgeon's Certificate is subject to discipline and he agrees to be bound by the Division's imposition of discipline as set forth in the Disciplinary Order below.

CIRCUMSTANCES IN MITIGATION

10. Respondent Leonard K. Scott, M.D. has never been the subject of any disciplinary action. He is admitting responsibility at an early stage in the proceedings.

RESERVATION

11. The admissions made by Respondent herein are only for the purposes of this proceeding, or any other proceedings in which the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of California, or other professional licensing agency is involved, and shall not be admissible in any other criminal or civil proceeding.

CONTINGENCY

- Quality. Respondent understands and agrees that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the Medical Board of California may communicate directly with the Division regarding this stipulation and settlement, without notice to or participation by Respondent. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that he may not withdraw his agreement or seek to rescind the stipulation prior to the time the Division considers and acts upon it. If the Division fails to adopt this stipulation as its Decision and Order, the Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order shall be of no force or effect, except for this paragraph, it shall be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties, and the Division shall not be disqualified from further action by having considered this matter.
- 13. The parties understand and agree that facsimile copies of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order, including facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.
- 14. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that the Division may, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following Disciplinary Order:

DISCIPLINARY ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Physician & Surgeon' Certificate No. A 28912 issued to Respondent Leonard K. Scott, M.D. is revoked. However, the revocation is stayed and Respondent is placed on probation for three (3) years on the following terms and conditions.

- Decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, respondent shall submit to the Division or its designee for its prior approval educational program(s) or course(s) which shall not be less than 40 hours per year, for each year of probation. The educational program(s) or course(s) shall be aimed at correcting any areas of deficient practice or knowledge and shall be Category I certified, limited to classroom, conference, or seminar settings. The educational program(s) or course(s) shall be at respondent's expense and shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education (CME) requirements for renewal of licensure. Following the completion of each course, the Division or its designee may administer an examination to test respondent's knowledge of the course. Respondent shall provide proof of attendance for 65 hours of continuing medical education of which 40 hours were in satisfaction of this condition.
- 2. **Prescribing Practices Course** Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, respondent shall enroll in a course in prescribing practices, at respondent's expense, approved in advance by the Division or its designee. Failure to successfully complete the course during the first 6 months of probation is a violation of probation.

A prescribing practices course taken after the acts that gave rise to the charges in the Accusation, but prior to the effective date of the Decision may, in the sole discretion of the Division or its designee, be accepted towards the fulfillment of this condition if the course would have been approved by the Division or its designee had the course been taken after the effective date of this Decision.

Respondent shall submit a certification of successful completion to the Division or its designee not later than 15 calendar days after successfully completing the course, or not later than 15 calendar days after the effective date of the Decision, whichever is later.

3. Medical Record Keeping Course Within 60 calendar days of the

effective date of this decision, respondent shall enroll in a course in medical record keeping, at respondent's expense, approved in advance by the Division or its designee. Failure to successfully complete the course during the first 6 months of probation is a violation of probation.

A medical record keeping course taken after the acts that gave rise to the charges in the Accusation, but prior to the effective date of the Decision may, in the sole discretion of the Division or its designee, be accepted towards the fulfillment of this condition if the course would have been approved by the Division or its designee had the course been taken after the effective date of this Decision.

Respondent shall submit a certification of successful completion to the Division or its designee not later than 15 calendar days after successfully completing the course, or not later than 15 calendar days after the effective date of the Decision, whichever is later.

4. Ethics Course Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, respondent shall enroll in a course in ethics, at respondent's expense, approved in advance by the Division or its designee. Failure to successfully complete the course during the first year of probation is a violation of probation.

An ethics course taken after the acts that gave rise to the charges in the Accusation, but prior to the effective date of the Decision may, in the sole discretion of the Division or its designee, be accepted towards the fulfillment of this condition if the course would have been approved by the Division or its designee had the course been taken after the effective date of this Decision.

Respondent shall submit a certification of successful completion to the Division or its designee not later than 15 calendar days after successfully completing the course, or not later than 15 calendar days after the effective date of the Decision, whichever is later..

5. Clinical Training Program Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, respondent shall enroll in a clinical training or educational program equivalent to the Physician Assessment and Clinical Education Program (PACE) offered at the University of California - San Diego School of Medicine ("Program").

The Program shall consist of a Comprehensive Assessment program comprised of a two-day assessment of respondent's physical and mental health; basic clinical and communication skills common to all clinicians; and medical knowledge, skill and judgment pertaining to respondent's specialty or sub-specialty, and at minimum, a 40 hour program of clinical education in the area of practice in which respondent was alleged to be deficient and which takes into account data obtained from the assessment, Decision(s), Accusation(s), and any other information that the Division or its designee deems relevant. Respondent shall pay all expenses associated with the clinical training program.

Based on respondent's performance and test results in the assessment and clinical education, the Program will advise the Division or its designee of its recommendation(s) for the scope and length of any additional educational or clinical training, treatment for any medical condition, treatment for any psychological condition, or anything else affecting respondent's practice of medicine. Respondent shall comply with Program recommendations.

At the completion of any additional educational or clinical training, Respondent shall submit to and pass an examination. The Program's determination whether or not Respondent passed the examination or successfully completed the Program shall be binding.

Respondent shall complete the Program not later than six months after Respondent's initial enrollment unless the Division or its designee agrees in writing to a later time for completion.

Failure to participate in and complete successfully all phases of the clinical training program outlined above is a violation of probation.

If Respondent fails to complete the clinical training program within the designated time period, Respondent shall cease the practice of medicine within 72 hours after being notified by the Division or its designee that Respondent failed to complete the clinical training program.

6. **Notification** Prior to engaging in the practice of medicine, the Respondent shall provide a true copy of the Decision(s) and Accusation(s) to the Chief of Staff or the Chief Executive Officer at every hospital where privileges or membership are extended to Respondent, at any other facility where Respondent engages in the practice of medicine,

including all physician and locum tenens registries or other similar agencies, and to the Chief Executive Officer at every insurance carrier which extends malpractice insurance coverage to Respondent. Respondent shall submit proof of compliance to the Division or its designee within 15 calendar days.

This condition shall apply to any change(s) in hospitals, other facilities or insurance carrier.

- 7. **Supervision of Physician Assistants** During probation, Respondent is prohibited from supervising physician assistants.
- 8. **Obey All Laws** Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, all rules governing the practice of medicine in California, and remain in full compliance with any court ordered criminal probation, payments and other orders.
- 9. Quarterly Declarations Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Division, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation. Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations not later than 10 calendar days after the end of the preceding quarter.
- Division's probation unit. Respondent shall, at all times, keep the Division informed of Respondent's business and residence addresses. Changes of such addresses shall be immediately communicated in writing to the Division or its designee. Under no circumstances shall a post office box serve as an address of record, except as allowed by Business and Professions Code section 2021(b).

Respondent shall not engage in the practice of medicine in Respondent's place of residence. Respondent shall maintain a current and renewed California physician's and surgeon's license.

Respondent shall immediately inform the Division, or its designee, in writing, of travel to any areas outside the jurisdiction of California which lasts, or is contemplated to last, more than 30 calendar days.

11. Interview With The Division, or Its Designee Respondent shall be

available in person for interviews either at Respondent's place of business or at the probation unit office, with the Division or its designee, upon request at various intervals, and either with or without prior notice throughout the term of probation.

12. **Residing or Practicing Out-of-State** In the event Respondent should leave the State of California to reside or to practice, Respondent shall notify the Division or its designee in writing 30 calendar days prior to the dates of departure and return. Non-practice is defined as any period of time exceeding 30 calendar days in which Respondent is not engaging in any activities defined in Sections 2051 and 2052 of the Business and Professions Code.

All time spent in an intensive training program outside the State of California which has been approved by the Division or its designee shall be considered as time spent in the practice of medicine within the State. A Board-ordered suspension of practice shall not be considered as a period of non-practice. Periods of temporary or permanent residence or practice outside California will not apply to the reduction of the probationary term. Periods of temporary or permanent residence or practice outside California will relieve Respondent of the responsibility to comply with the probationary terms and conditions with the exception of this condition and the following terms and conditions of probation: Obey All Laws; Probation Unit Compliance; and Cost Recovery.

Respondent's license shall be automatically canceled if Respondent's periods of temporary or permanent residence or practice outside California total two years. However, Respondent's license shall not be canceled as long as Respondent is residing and practicing medicine in another state of the United States and is on active probation with the medical licensing authority of that state, in which case the two year period shall begin on the date probation is completed or terminated in that state.

Respondent resides in the State of California and for any reason Respondent stops practicing medicine in California, Respondent shall notify the Division or its designee in writing within 30 calendar days prior to the dates of non-practice and return to practice. Any period of non-practice within California, as defined in this condition, will not apply to the reduction of the

,26

probationary term and does not relieve Respondent of the responsibility to comply with the terms and conditions of probation. Non-practice is defined as any period of time exceeding 30 calendar days in which Respondent is not engaging in any activities defined in sections 2051 and 2052 of the Business and Professions Code.

All time spent in an intensive training program which has been approved by the Division or its designee shall be considered time spent in the practice of medicine. For purposes of this condition, non-practice due to a Board-ordered suspension or in compliance with any other condition of probation, shall not be considered a period of non-practice.

Respondent's license shall be automatically canceled if Respondent resides in California and for a total of two years, fails to engage in California in any of the activities described in Business and Professions Code sections 2051 and 2052.

- 14. **Completion of Probation** Respondent shall comply with all financial obligations (e.g., cost recovery, restitution, probation costs) not later than 120 calendar days prior to the completion of probation. Upon successful completion of probation, Respondent's certificate shall be fully restored.
- 15. Violation of Probation Failure to fully comply with any term or condition of probation is a violation of probation. If Respondent violates probation in any respect, the Division, after giving Respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an Accusation, Petition to Revoke Probation, or an Interim Suspension Order is filed against Respondent during probation, the Division shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.
- Decision or other period agreed to by the Division or its designee, Respondent shall reimburse the Division the amount of \$3,000.00 for its investigative and prosecution costs. The filing of bankruptcy or period of non-practice by Respondent shall not relieve the Respondent of his obligation to reimburse the Division for its costs.
 - 17. License Surrender Following the effective date of this Decision, if

Respondent ceases practicing due to retirement, health reasons or is otherwise unable to satisfy the terms and conditions of probation, Respondent may request the voluntary surrender of Respondent's license. The Division reserves the right to evaluate Respondent's request and to exercise its discretion whether or not to grant the request, or to take any other action deemed appropriate and reasonable under the circumstances. Upon formal acceptance of the surrender, Respondent shall within 15 calendar days deliver Respondent's wallet and wall certificate to the Division or its designee and Respondent shall no longer practice medicine. Respondent will no longer be subject to the terms and conditions of probation and the surrender of Respondent's license shall be deemed disciplinary action. If Respondent re-applies for a medical license, the application shall be treated as a petition for reinstatement of a revoked certificate.

18. **Probation Monitoring Costs** Respondent shall pay the costs associated with probation monitoring each and every year of probation, as designated by the Division, which are currently set at \$2,874.00 but may be adjusted on an annual basis. Such costs shall be payable to the Medical Board of California and delivered to the Division or its designee no later than January 31 of each calendar year. Failure to pay costs within 30 calendar days of the due date is a violation of probation.

ACCEPTANCE

I have carefully read the Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order. I
understand the stipulation and the effect it will have on my Physician & Surgeon Certificate.
enter into this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order voluntarily, knowingly, and
intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Division of Medical
Quality, Medical Board of California.
Quality, Medical Board of California. DATED: 5/26/6.

LEONARD K. SCOTT, M.D.

ENDORSEMENT

The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of California of the Department of Consumer Affairs.

DATED: $\frac{5/28/04}{}$

BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General of the State of California

RICHARD D. MARINO Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Complainant

DOJ Docket/Matter ID Number: 03573160-LA2002AD ScottStipulation3.wpd

Exhibit A
Accusation No. 11-2002-133222

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

SACRAMENTO CANDAY 23 20 02

BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General of the State of California
RICHARD AVILA, State Bar No. 91214
Deputy Attorney General
For RICHARD D. MARINO,
Deputy Attorney General
California Department of Justice
300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 897-8644

Attorneys for Complainant

Facsimile: (213) 897-9395

BEFORE THE
DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

LEONARD K. SCOTT, M.D.
722 La Porte Drive
La Canada, California 91011

Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 28912

Respondent.

Case No. 11-2002-133222

A C C U S A T I O N

Complainant alleges:

PARTIES

- 1. Ron Joseph (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs.
- 2. On or about March 21, 1975, the Medical Board of California issued
 Physician and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 28912 to LEONARD K. SCOTT, M.D.

 (Respondent). The Physician and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein.

JURISDICTION

3. This Accusation is brought before the Division of Medical Quality
(Division) for the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs under the

authority of the below mentioned statutes and regulations.1

4. Section 2004 of the Code states:

"The Division of Medical Quality shall have the responsibility for the following:

- "(a) The enforcement of the disciplinary and criminal provisions of the Medical Practice Act.
 - "(b) The administration and hearing of disciplinary actions.
- "(c) Carrying out disciplinary actions appropriate to findings made by a medical quality review committee, the division, or an administrative law judge.
- "(d) Suspending, revoking, or otherwise limiting certificates after the conclusion of disciplinary actions.
- "(e) Reviewing the quality of medical practice carried out by physician and surgeon certificate holders under the jurisdiction of the board."
 - 5. Section 2227 of the Code states:
- "(a) A licensee whose matter has been heard by an administrative law judge of the Medical Quality Hearing Panel as designated in Section 11371 of the Government Code, or whose default has been entered, and who is found guilty may, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter:
 - "(1) Have his or her license revoked upon order of the division.
- "(2) Have his or her right to practice suspended for a period not to exceed one year upon order of the division.
- "(3) Be placed on probation and be required to pay the costs of probation monitoring upon order of the division.
 - "(4) Be publicly reprimanded by the division.
- "(5) Have any other action taken in relation to discipline as the division or an administrative law judge may deem proper.

^{1.} All statutory references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.

"(b) Any matter heard pursuant to subdivision (a), except for warning letters, medical review or advisory conferences, or other matters made confidential or privileged by existing law, is deemed public, and shall be made available to the public by the board."

6. Section 2234 of the Code states:

"The Division of Medical Quality shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- "(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate, any provision of this chapter [Chapter 5, the Medical Practice Act].
 - "(b) Gross negligence.
 - "(c) Repeated negligent acts.
 - "(d) Incompetence.
- "(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
- "(f) Any action or conduct which would have warranted the denial of a certificate."
 - 7. Section 2242, subdivision (a) of the Code states:
- "(a) Prescribing, dispensing, or furnishing dangerous drugs as defined in Section 4022 without a good faith prior examination and medical indication therefor, constitutes unprofessional conduct.
 - 8. Section 2264 of the Code states:

"The employing, directly or indirectly, the aiding, or the abetting of any unlicenced person or any suspended, revoked, or unlicenced practitioner to engage in the practice of medicine or any other mode of treating the sick or afflicted which requires a license to practice constitutes unprofessional conduct."

9. Section 2416 of the Code states:

"Physicians and surgeons and podiatrists may conduct their professional practices in a partnership or group of physicians and surgeons or a partnership or group of podiatrists, respectively. Physicians and surgeons and podiatrists may establish a professional partnership that includes both physicians and surgeons and podiatrists, if both of the following conditions are satisfied:

- "(a) A majority of the partners and partnership interests in the professional partnership are physicians and surgeons or osteopathic physicians and surgeons.
- "(b) Notwithstanding Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 15001) of Title 1 of the Corporations Code, a partner who is not a physician and surgeon shall not practice in the partnership or vote on partnership matters related to the practice of medicine that are outside his or her scope of practice. All partners may vote on general administrative, management, and business matters."
 - 10. Section 2417 of the Code states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) Any type of business organization that holds itself out to the public as an organization practicing medicine, or that a reasonably informed person would believe is engaged in the practice of medicine, shall be owned and operated only by one or more licensed physicians and surgeons. . . .
- "(b) A physician and surgeon who knowingly practices medicine with a business organization not owned or operated in compliance with subdivision (a) shall have his or her license permanently revoked."
 - 11. Section 1349 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations states:

"Nothing in Section 2416 of the code or this article shall be construed to authorize a partnership agreement in which fees are combined or shared between a physician and surgeon(s) and a podiatrist(s) or any other licensed professional, not a physician and surgeon."

12. Section 2266 of the Code states: "The failure of a physician and surgeon to maintain adequate and accurate records relating to the provision of services to their patients constitutes unprofessional conduct."

part:

13. Section 14124.12 of the Welfare and Institutions Code states, in pertinent

- "(a) Upon receipt of written notice from the Medical Board of California, the Osteopathic Medical Board of California, or the Board of Dental Examiners of California, that a licensee's license has been placed on probation as a result of a disciplinary action, the department may not reimburse any Medi-Cal claim for the type of surgical service or invasive procedure that gave rise to the probation, including any dental surgery or invasive procedure, that was performed by the licensee on or after the effective date of probation and until the termination of all probationary terms and conditions or until the probationary period has ended, whichever occurs first. This section shall apply except in any case in which the relevant licensing board determines that compelling circumstances warrant the continued reimbursement during the probationary period of any Medi-Cal claim, including any claim for dental services, as so described. In such a case, the department shall continue to reimburse the licensee for all procedures, except for those invasive or surgical procedures for which the licensee was placed on probation."
- 14. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Division may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Gross Negligence)

- 15. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234, subdivision (b) of the Code, in that respondent engaged in acts and omissions in the care and treatment of two patients constituting multiple extreme departures from the standard of practice. The circumstances are as follows:
 - A. On or about October 6, 1994, The Weight Loss Centre, Inc., was incorporated as a general business in California, with Lisa Stevens listed as its sole director and chief executive officer. It was located in various communities, and was also

licensed to do business by the City of Palm Desert, with Lisa Stevens listed as its president, beginning on November 1, 1994, as well as by the City of Rancho Mirage, with Lisa Stevens listed as its president, beginning on August 24, 2001. Its corporate status was suspended by the Secretary of State of California on March 1, 2002. Lisa Stevens has never been licensed as a physician and surgeon in California.

- B. On or about June 20, 2001, two Medical Board agents visited the Weight Loss Centre, Inc., in Cathedral City and spoke with Lisa Stevens, who informed them that the clinic was operated by respondent and Dr. Michael G. Franco. Stevens advised the investigators that it cost \$150.00 to begin treatment for weight loss, which included an examination and evaluation by a physician, who was only present on Friday afternoons, as well as a one week supply of medication. Stevens explained further that they would be seen by a nurse three times a week, receive medication and B-12 injections thereafter at a cost of \$45.00 every week for each one of them.
- C. On or about August 14, 2001, Vanessa Ruiz, a former medical assistant at the Weight Loss Centre in Cathedral City during the period February through October 2000, disclosed that her duties there had included packaging medication, collecting money for services rendered, issuing receipts, dispensing medication to patients, and giving B-12 injections. Ruiz stated that no physician was ever present in the clinic when she gave these B-12 injections. Ruiz explained how she would put the patient's name and a date on the medication label when she dispensed it, and that each package she dispensed also had a label with the clinic's name, the prescribing physician's name, the physician's medical license number, and the physician's Drug Enforcement Administration number. Ruiz explained further that she would fax a list of the medications she dispensed each day to Lisa Stevens.
- D. On or about March 1, 2002, two Medical Board investigators, a male and female, posing as patients, visited the Weight Loss Centre in Rancho Mirage. They were greeted by a receptionist named Connie Olvera, who had them fill-out patient registration forms. They were seen by Dr. Michael G. Franco, who discussed a two-page

diet plan with them. Dr. Franco measured their blood pressure, and with a stethoscope listened to their hearts and lungs. The female investigator informed Dr. Franco that she had a heart murmur, and he responded that it sounded like the murmur was coming from one of the heart valves. Dr. Franco advised the female investigator to have her family physician perform an echocardiogram. Dr. Franco informed the male investigator that his blood pressure was 140/100, and then directed both investigators to the scale to be weighed by Connie Olvera. Dr. Franco documented that he examined the eyes, ears, nose, throat, abdomen, skin and relfexes of both investigator/patients, as well as the glands and extremities of the male investigator/patient, none of which took place. Dr. Franco did not document the female investigator's blood pressure, her reported heart murmur history, or his heart murmur finding by examination.

E. Later during this same visit, Connie Olvera recorded the female's weight as 171 pounds, and the male's weight as 216 pounds. She then measured their hips, waists, chests and biceps. Next, she gave the female investigator two small Ziplock bags, containing Plegine (i.e., Phendimatrazine) and Hydrochlorothiazide. She gave the male investigator three small Ziplock bags containing the same medications. The clinic medical records on each patient for this date show that each was to take a Plegine pill three times daily and one Hydrochlorothiazide pill every other day. Each investigator gave Connie Olvera \$150.00, arranged for a follow-up appointment, and then left the clinic.

F. On or about March 6, 2002, the same two Medical Board investigators returned to the clinic posing as patients. Connie Olvera weighed both of them, and advised that they needed to take their medication three times daily. Olvera then informed the female investigator that she was going to give her an injection, but the investigator declined. Olvera recorded blood pressures of 160/100 for the female, and 146/102 for the male. Olvera then gave each investigator three small Ziplock bags, which included water pills not prescribed by a physician. Olvera told the investigators that they were receiving Bontril (i.e., Phendimetrazine). The clinic medical records for each

investigator/patient show that they received Plegine and Hydrocholorothiazide on this date.

- G. On or about March 15, 2002, the same Medical Board investigators returned to the clinic posing as patients. They were seen by Lisa Stevens, who informed them that she owned the clinic, paid the bills, and was not a nurse. Stevens weighed the female investigator and then took her into an examination room to receive an injection of B-12, which the investigator declined. After weighing the male investigator, Stevens was joined by respondent, who discussed weight loss with both investigators. The male investigator asked respondent if he could give him something that would help him more. Respondent responded that he could try Phentermine. Without examining either investigator/patient, respondent gave two small Ziplock bags of medication to each one. The clinic's medical records show that on this date the male investigator was given Phentermine and Hydrochlorothiazide, and the female investigator was given Bontril. No blood pressure was recorded for either investigator/patient in the clinic's medical records for them.
- H. Bontril and Plegine, both Phendimetrazine, are contraindicated for patients with a history of hypertension.
- I. Phentermine is contraindicated for patients with a history of hypertension, and is not to be used in combination drug therapy due to the possibility of valvular heart disease and pulmonary hypertension.
- J. Hydrochlorothiazide, a diuretic, is not indicated for the treatment of obesity, and can cause low sodium, low potassium and other electrolyte imbalances which can be life-threatening.
- K. Respondent engaged in multiple extreme departures from the standard of practice in the care and treatment of two patients as follows:
 - (1) By failing to evaluate the male patient's blood pressure on follow-up by physical examination or laboratory testing, in light of the patient's existing Phendimetrazine use; and/or

failing to document same.

- (2) By failing to evaluate the female patient's blood pressure on follow-up by physical examination or laboratory testing, in light of the patient's existing Phendimetrazine use; and/or failing to document same.
- (3) By failing to order a blood test for the male patient, and not questioning him, to determine the possible side effects of his Hydrochlorothiazide use, which can be life-threatening; and/or failing to document same.
- (4) By failing to order a blood test for the female patient, and not questioning her, to determine the possible side effects of her Hydrochlorothiazide use; and/or failing to document same.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeat Negligent Acts)

- 16. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234, subdivision (c) of the Code, in that respondent engaged in acts and omissions in the care and treatment of two patients constituting multiple departures from the standard of practice. The circumstances are as follows:
 - A. The facts and circumstances stated at above numbered paragraph

 15 are incorporated by reference herein as if fully set forth.
 - B. Respondent engaged in multiple departures from the standard of practice in the care and treatment of two patients as follows:
 - (1) By failing to evaluate the male patient's blood pressure on follow-up by physical examination or laboratory testing, in light of the patient's existing Phendimetrazine use; and/or failing to document same.
 - (2) By failing to evaluate the female patient's blood pressure

31		
1	on follow-up by physical examination or laboratory testing,	
2	in light of the patient's existing Phendimetrazine use;	
3	and/or failing to document same.	
4	(3) By failing to order a blood test for the male patient, and not	
5	questioning him, to determine the possible side effects of	
6	his Hydrochlorothiazide use, which can be life-	
7	threastening; and/or failing to document same.	
8	(4) By failing to order a blood test for the female patient, and	
9	not questioning her, to determine the possible side effects	
10	of her Hydrochlorothiazide use; and/or failing to document	
11	same.	
12	THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE	
13	(Incompetence)	
14	17. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234,	
15	subdivision (d) of the Code, in that respondent demonstrated a lack of medical knowledge and	
16	judgment in the care and treatment of two patients. The circumstances are as follows:	
17	A. The facts, circumstances and opinions stated at above numbered	
18	paragraph 15 are incorporated by reference herein as if fully set forth.	
19	FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE	
20	(Prescribing Without Indication)	
21	18. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2242 of the	
22	Code, in that respondent prescribed, and caused to be dispensed, dangerous drugs to two patients	
23	without a good faith prior examination and medical indication therefor. The circumstances are a	
24	follows:	
25	A. The facts, circumstances and opinions stated at above numbered	
26	paragraph 15 are incorporated by reference herein as if fully set forth.	
27	///	
28	///	

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE 1 2 (Aiding and Abetting Unlicensed Practice) 3 19. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 2264, 2416 and 2417 of the Code, as well as section 1349 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations, in 5 that respondent aided and abetted an individual not licensed as a physician and surgeon to engage 6 in the practice of medicine. The circumstances are as follows: 7 A. The facts, circumstances and opinions stated at above numbered 8 paragraph 15 are incorporated by reference herein as if fully set forth. 9 SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE 10 (Inadequate Records) 20. 11 Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2266 of the Code, in that respondent failed to maintain adequate and accurate records of the care and 12 13 treatment provided to two patients. The circumstances are as follows: 14 A. The facts, circumstances and opinions stated at above numbered 15 paragraph 15 are incorporated by reference herein as if fully set forth. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

24

25

26

27

<u>PRAYER</u>

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Division of Medical Quality issue a decision:

- 1. Revoking or suspending Physician and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 28912, issued to LEONARD K. SCOTT, M.D.;
- 2. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of LEONARD K. SCOTT, M.D.'s authority to supervise physician's assistants, pursuant to section 3527 of the Code;
- 3. Ordering LEONARD K. SCOTT, M.D. to pay the Division of Medical Quality the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, and, if placed on probation, the costs of probation monitoring;
 - 4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: January 23, 2003

RON JOSEPH
Executive Director
Medical Board of California
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Complainant